

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Applicants note the objections to the drawings noted by the Examiner and have filed replacement drawings with the USPTO on September 6, 2005.

As a courtesy, a copy of FIG. 1 filed on September 6, 2005 is attached to this Response.

**REMARKS**

**A.) The Section 112 Rejection**

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 15 renders this rejection moot.

**B.) The Section 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,856,297 to Durham et al. (“Durham”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the claims of the present invention includes a plurality of support structures connecting through portions of an inner surface and supporting and connecting the inner surface and an outer surface, where the surfaces are a part of an inflatable body. Durham does not disclose or suggest such support structures.

None of the baffles 312 in Durham connect through a surface. Additionally, the feed line/control lines 303 (which are not shown in FIG. 10 of Durham) are indicated as passing through inflatable structure 306 but do not provide support, as is required by claims 1, 3, 5 and 15 of the present invention.

Because Durham does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed inventions, Durham cannot anticipate claims 1, 3, 5 and 15. Accordingly,

**C.) The Section 103 Rejections of Claims 2 and 4**

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Durham in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,510,500 to Brune (“Brune”). In addition, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Durham in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,876 to Maroko et al. (“Maroko”).

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants note that claims 2 and 4 depend on claim 1 and therefore are patentable over a combination of Durham and Brune or Durham and Maroko because neither Brune nor Maroko make up for the deficiencies of Durham discussed above.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner’s admission that, with respect to claim 2, Durham does not disclose or suggest an inner surface of an inflatable body that is mounted to a dirigible. With respect to claim 4, Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner’s admission that Durham does not disclose or suggest a support structure which comprises a plurality of tubes where one of the tubes is a coaxial transmission line.

For these and other reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the combination of Durham/Brune nor Durham/Maroko renders obvious the claims of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 2 and 4.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

In the event this Response does not place the present application in condition for allowance, applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 to schedule a personal interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000